

**REMARKS**

Claims 1 - 3 have been canceled by a prior amendment without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter thereof. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the subject matter of the canceled claims in the subject application and/or subsequently filed continuing applications.

Claims 4, 19, and 34 have been amended.

Claims 4 - 51 are present in the subject application.

In the Office Action dated February 4, 2009, the Examiner has rejected claims 4 - 51 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Favorable reconsideration of the subject application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

The Examiner has rejected claims 4 - 51 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Examiner takes the position that the terms “a solution space represented by one or more nodes”, “hardware architecture is based on processing said nodes”, “in accordance with” the user software application, and “topology suitable for determining said solution” are unclear.

Initially, the Examiner indicated that he cannot interpret the meanings of the claims, and requested a detailed showing of support for at least the system claims and suggested search terms. In order to assist the Examiner with understanding the claimed invention and expediting prosecution of the subject application, Applicants provided the Examiner (prior to this amendment) with supplemental materials including an explanation of an embodiment of the present invention and an example detailed mapping of independent claim 4 with the specification.

This rejection is respectfully traversed since the claims are considered to be clear and definite. However, in order to expedite prosecution of the subject application, independent claims 4, 19, and 34 have been amended in accordance with the Examiner's comments to further clarify the features of the claimed invention. Accordingly, claims 4 - 51 are considered to comply with 35 U.S.C. §112.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to find the application to be in condition for allowance with claims 4 - 51. However, if for any reason the Examiner feels that further explanation would be helpful, or that the application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney to discuss any unresolved issues and to expedite the disposition of the application.

Filed concurrently herewith is a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) and a Petition for an Extension of Time of One Month. Applicants hereby petition for any extension of time that may be necessary to maintain the pendency of this application. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any additional fees required for the above-identified application or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 05-0460.

Dated: 06/02/09

**EDELL, SHAPIRO & FINNAN, LLC**  
**CUSTOMER NO.**  
1901 Research Boulevard, Suite 400  
Rockville, MD 20850  
(301) 424-3640

Respectfully submitted by:

/Stuart B. Shapiro/  
Stuart B. Shapiro  
Reg. No. 40169